



Appl. No. 10/054,390  
Amendment filed October 13, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 14, 2006

Docket No. RKP-5521

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

In the "Application Papers" portion of the Office Action Summary, both the "accepted" box and the "objected" box were checked in response to the drawings filed on April 3, 2006. Applicant has corrected errors in the drawings filed on April 3, 2006, by the attached four replacement sheets of drawings. The attached four replacement sheets of drawings include FIGS. 1-4B and replace the drawings filed on April 3, 2006, that included FIGS. 1-4B. In the drawings, crossed-out words have been deleted, and other minor informalities corrected. FIG. 3 has been moved to the first sheet. FIG. 2 has been expanded to correspond to the steps set forth on in the Detailed Description. Because the steps illustrated in FIG. 2 are all set forth in the Detailed Description, no new matter has been added by the amendments to the drawings.



Appl. No. 10/054,390  
Amendment filed October 13, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 14, 2006

Docket No. RKP-5521

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 have been amended. Claim 12 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 13-21 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-11 and 13-21 are now pending in this application. A Request for Continued Examination has been filed with this Amendment so that the Examiner may fully consider the new and amended claims and the following remarks.

### **Amendments to the Specification**

An amended specification was submitted with the Amendment filed on April 3, 2006. However, the submission does not appear to have met the requirements of 37 CFR §1.125 for a substitute specification. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the submission not be entered, and instead the attached Substitute Specification be entered in its place. No new matter has been added by the Substitute Specification.

The Title and Abstract have also been amended as set forth above.

### **Drawings**

In the "Application Papers" portion of the Office Action Summary of the Office Action mailed June 14, 2006, both the "accepted" box and the "objected" box were checked in response to the drawings filed on April 3, 2006. As discussed above, Applicant has filed replacement drawing sheets with this Amendment that correct errors in the drawings filed on April 3, 2006.

**35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,459,506 - hereafter "Hu") in view of Hamilton (U.S. Patent No. 6,462,842 - hereafter "Hamilton"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for the following reasons.

The invention, as claimed in claim 1, is directed to an apparatus that scans, processes, manages and organizes expense data from receipts. The Hu reference teaches merely scanning a document and preserving the scanned document in a computer as an image (see Hu, e.g., col. 4, lines 7-18). Hu does not teach or suggest automatically processing the scanned image to collect and organize expense information from the scanned image, such as in the form of tables, pie charts, and the like. In other words, a key feature of Applicant's claim 1, which is automatic processing and organization of data from the scanned receipts to obtain expense information is not taught or suggested by the Hu reference.

The present invention deals with expense data extraction, organizing the expense data automatically and is not directed to just scanning an image. Hu, on the other hand relates to a mobile scanner capable of scanning a material to obtain an image in a standard image format, such as TIFF, BMP, etc., and then manipulating the image with an image manipulation program, such as PhotoShop® (see col. 4,

lines 7-18). Thus, Hu does not teach or suggest scanning receipts to extract expense data from the scanned image and organizing or displaying the extracted expense information in the manner taught by the present invention.

Hamilton fails to make up for the shortcomings in Hu discussed above. Hamilton is directed to an apparatus, program and method of controlling a scanner for increasing data throughput, increasing available resolutions, and reducing aliasing (see Hamilton, e.g., col. 2, lines 47-50). Hamilton improves scanning time by including a data rate adjustment circuit that allows the scanner to match the average data transfer rate of an associated device to avoid restarts (see col. 2, lines 51-60). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Hamilton does not teach or suggest a software that automatically processes and organizes information from scanned receipts to obtain expense information. Hamilton neither discloses nor suggests processing numerical data from the scanned data, or organizing the processed data to obtain expense information, as set forth in Applicant's claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention, as claimed in claim 1, cannot be obvious in light of the combination of Hu and Hamilton.

New independent claims 13 and 18 include limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and therefore are not obvious in light of the combination of Hu and Hamilton for the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1. The remaining claims depend from these independent claims, set forth additional patentable features, and also are not obvious in light of the combination of Hu and

Hamilton for the reasons set forth above, and because they depend from allowable base claims.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Colin D. Barnitz", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Colin D. Barnitz  
Registration No. 35,061

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.  
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1120  
Date: October 13, 2006